

homonymy between the myxomycete and molluscan names. Also, I am opposed to emending the spelling of TRICHIINAE Ložek, 1956 (Gastropoda) to TRICHIAINAE, which would be confusing. The priority of TROCHULINAE Lindholm, 1927 is therefore convenient and leads me to prefer the name *Trochulus* Alten, 1812 to *Trichia* Hartmann, 1840. If the molluscan *Trichia* were split into two separate genera for taxonomic reasons there could be no objection to learning a new generic name for some of the species. I do not see that the inconvenience will be much greater in learning a new generic name for all the species currently in *Trichia*.

Additional references

- Cavalier-Smith, T. 1997. A revised six-kingdom system of life. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 73: 203–266.
Martin, G.W., Alexopoulos, C.J. & Farr, M.L. 1983. *The genera of Myxomycetes*. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City.
Parker, S.P. 1982. *Synopsis and classification of living organisms*, vol. 1. McGraw-Hill.

Comment on the proposed designation of *Buprestis nitida* Rossi, 1792 (currently *Anthaxia fulgurans* (Schrank, 1789)) as the type species of *Anthaxia* Eschscholtz, 1829 (Insecta, Coleoptera)

(Case 3118; see BZN 57: 97–99)

Chuck Bellamy

Department of Entomology, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County,
900 Exposition Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90007, U.S.A.

I should like to support the application by Dr Bílý to designate the nominal species *Buprestis nitida* Rossi, 1792 (a synonym of *B. fulgurans* Schrank, 1789) as the type species of *Anthaxia* Eschscholtz, 1829. Dr Bílý's world catalogue of the genus (Bílý, 1997) is the authoritative source for the established concepts of *Anthaxia* and its subgenera, and acceptance of his application would be in the interests of stability. To follow any of the early type designations (see para. 2 of the application) would upset the modern definition of a very large genus in which relationships are only now becoming understood.

It is worth noting that besides *Anthaxia* there are other genus-group names in the BUPRESTIDAE which might be affected by type designations made by Duponchel (in d'Orbigny, 1842) or by Desmarest (in Chenu, 1860); such designations may have been overlooked, because no complete list of type species in this family has been published.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Orsodacne* Latreille, 1802 (Insecta, Coleoptera) by the designation of *Chrysomela cerasi* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species

(Case 3103; see BZN 57: 94–96)

Chris Reid

CBCR, Australian Museum, 6 College Street, Sydney, NSW 2000, Australia

In his application Hans Silfverberg has presented a compelling case for setting aside the original type species fixation, by monotypy, of the genus *Orsodacne* Latreille, 1802.

I strongly endorse his case. There seems little sense in changing the nomenclature of an important group of insects (para. 5 of the application), the family ORSODACNIDAE Thomson, 1859 being the probable sister-taxon of CHRYSOMELIDAE (see Kuschel & May, 1990; Reid, 1995; Lawrence & Newton, 1995), because of events 198 years ago overlooked by all subsequent authors.

Additional references

- Kuschel, G. & May, B.M. 1990. Palophaginae, a new subfamily for leaf-beetles, feeding as adult and larva on araucarian pollen in Australia (Coleoptera: Megalopodidae). *Invertebrate Taxonomy*, 3(6): 697–719
- Reid, C.A.M. 1995. A cladistic analysis of subfamilial relationships in the Chrysomelidae sensu lato (Chrysomeloidea). Pp. 559–631 in Pakaluk, J. & Ślipiński, S.A. (Eds.), *Biology, phylogeny & classification of Coleoptera; papers celebrating the 80th birthday of Roy A. Crowson*. Muzeum i Instytut Zoologii PAN, Warszawa.

Comment on the proposed conservation of LORISIDAE Gray, 1821 and GALAGIDAE Gray, 1825 (Mammalia, Primates) as the correct original spellings
(Case 3004; see BZN 55: 165–168; 56: 73; 57: 51, 121–123)

Kenneth Mowbray

Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York 10024, U.S.A.

Ian Tattersall

Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York 10024, U.S.A.

Jeffrey H. Schwartz

Department of Anthropology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260, U.S.A.

In their request to the Commission to reject our proposal to conserve LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE as correct original spellings (to which we responded, BZN 57: 121–123, June 2000), Groves and Jenkins (BZN 57: 51, March 2000) in part based their argument for rejection of these spellings on the fact that we had not included discussion of the family name INDRIIDAE. Their point was that, if we objected to Jenkins's (1987) revival of the original spelling of the family names as LORIDAE and GALAGONIDAE, why had we not also objected to her revival of the original spelling of the family name INDRIDAE? As we stated in our previous communication (BZN 57: 121–123), we had not wanted to confuse our existing proposals with discussion of the latter. However, the case for retaining INDRIIDAE as the correct spelling of the family name is as straightforward as that for LORISIDAE and GALAGIDAE.

Gmelin (1788, p. 42) introduced the specific name *indri* in the binomen *Lemur indri*, and E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (in E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire & Cuvier, 1796, p. 46)